REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Primary Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the June 20, 2002, personal interview.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1-13 and add new claims 14-37. Thus, claims 1-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3-7, 7-11 and 13 stand rejected, and claims 2, 8 and 12 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form by the Office Action dated March 11, 2002, and the personal interview conducted with Examiner T. Rude and his supervising Primary Examiner T. Ton on June 20, 2002. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) asserting that they fail to show certain items described in the specification. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that these items are structural details that are essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention and should be in the drawings. MPEP § 608.02(d). This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specific items referenced in the objection, namely a data bus line 3, a semiconductor layer 5, an ohmic contact layer 6, a source electrode 7, a drain electrode 9 and gate electrode 11 are properly referenced throughout the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would properly understand the claims as supported by the specification and corresponding figures. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner objects to claims 2, 8 and 12 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. For the purpose of expediting the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims 2, 8 and 12. Claims 2, 8 and 12 are in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c).

The Examiner rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. For the purpose of expediting the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claim 7. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of co-pending Application No. 09/448,276 further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,833 to Yamada et al. (hereinafter Yamada); claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's admitted prior art" (APA) in view of Yamada. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In view of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting the prosecution of the application, Applicants hereby submit a Terminal Disclaimer.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's admitted prior art" (APA) in view of Yamada. In order to expedite prosecution, and in view of the June 20, 2002, personal interview, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, and 13 are allowable over the cited references.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone call would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

Docket No.: 8733.032.20

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 1, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

Song K. Jung

Registration No.: 35,210

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006 (202) 496-7500

Attachment: Version With Markings to Show Changes Made to the Claims

30827
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Version With Markings to Show Changes Made to the Claims

- 1. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device comprising:
- first and second substrates facing each other and having a pixel region;
- a liquid crystal layer between the first and second substrates;
- a first dielectric frame on one side of the pixel region;
- a second dielectric frame on another side of the pixel region; and
- a [third] dielectric <u>protrusion [frame]</u> between the first dielectric frame and the second dielectric frame.
- 2. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein the [third] dielectric [frame has] protrusion acts as a spacer to establish a cell gap of the liquid crystal display device.
- 3. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 2, wherein the [third] dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> is expanded from the first substrate to the second substrate.
- 4. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 2, wherein the [third] dielectric [frame] protrusion is expanded from the second substrate to the first substrate.

- 5. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein the height of the [third] dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> is equal to that of the first dielectric frame.
- 6. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein the [width] height of the [third] dielectric [frame] protrusion is equal to that of the second dielectric frame.
- 7. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein the [width] <u>height</u> of the [third] dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> is [wider] <u>higher</u> than that of the first and second dielectric frames.
- 8. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein said <u>first and second</u> dielectric frames <u>surround</u> [has] at least three sides of the pixel region.
- 9. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device comprising:

 first and second substrates facing each other and having a pixel [region] that <u>is</u> divided into a plurality of regions;
 - a liquid crystal layer between the first and second substrates;
- a first dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> on one side of <u>a first one of the [pixel region</u>, in each of the] divided pixel <u>regions [region]</u>;
- a second dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> on another side of <u>the first one of the [pixel region, in each of the] divided pixel <u>regions</u> [region]; and</u>

Docket No.: 8733.032.20

a third dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> between the first dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> and the second dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u>.

- 10. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 9, wherein the third dielectric [frame] protrusion acts as a spacer to maintain a cell gap of the liquid crystal display device.
- 11. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 9, wherein the third dielectric [frame] <u>protrusion</u> is [formed] <u>located at a central portion</u> of each divided pixel region.
- 12. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 9, wherein the <u>first and second</u> dielectric [frames] <u>protrusions surround</u> [has around each of] <u>the</u> first one of the divided pixel regions [region].
- 13. (Amended) The multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 9, wherein each of the divided pixel <u>regions</u> [region] has a different driving property <u>from</u> each other.